

Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

OFFICE: Tonopah Field Office

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-B020-2014-0039-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: 2014 Reveille HMA Horse Gather file

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Reveille HMA Horse Gather

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: The Reveille HMA is located approximately 70 miles east of Tonopah, Nevada and south of U.S. Highway 6 and State Highway 375 in Nye County (Figure 1).

APPLICANT (if any): None

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

Under the Proposed Action, approximately 120 horses would be gathered using helicopter trapping methods and approximately 70 horses would be permanently removed from BLM lands adjacent to and within the Reveille Herd Management Area (HMA) boundaries (see Figure 1). As proposed, horses would first be gathered from areas of the Reveille Allotment outside of the HMA. Depending on the number of animals gathered from outside of the HMA, the gather would continue within the HMA until the 120-horse goal is reached. Horses gathered from outside the HMA would be permanently removed. Those gathered from within the HMA would be selected and removed to ensure that the post-gather population consists of diverse age groups and exhibit physical characteristics consistent with the historic population. Porcine Zona Pellucida (PZP-22) would be administered to captured mares selected for release back to the HMA. Hair samples will be collected from at least 25 horses returned to the HMA for genetic analysis.

This action is needed because wild horses in excess of established Appropriate Management Levels (AML; FMUD, 2001) are present within the HMA and outside of HMA boundaries within the Reveille Allotment. Under the Court Order issued by the United States District Court for the District of Nevada on November 13, 1987 to implement the Stipulated Settlement dated October 1, 1987 and Interior Board of Land Appeal (IBLA) Orders dated August 20, 2001 and January 24, 2002, the BLM is required to promptly remove wild horses in the Reveille HMA when the wild horse population is documented to be in excess of the established AML (FMUD, 2001) of 138 horses. Further, the action is needed to protect rangeland resources from deterioration associated with an overpopulation of wild horses, and to restore and maintain a thriving natural ecological balance and multiple use relationship on the public lands consistent with the provisions of Section 3(b) (2) of the 1971 *Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act* (WFRHBA).

The following table illustrates the AML for the Reveille HMA, the current population of wild horses, the numbers proposed to be gathered and estimated post-gather population.

Reveille HMA Established AML and Population Estimates

HMA	Maximum AML	2014 Population Estimate		Est. Number to be Removed	Est. Post-gather Population
		Nov 2013 (Inventory flight)	Spring 2014 Post-Foaling Pop (20% recruitment rate)		
Reveille	138	140	168	70	98

The gather would be conducted using BLM's National Drive-trapping contract. Gather operations would begin on or around October 1, 2014. Gather operations would be conducted in accordance with the Reveille Gather Plan and its Standard Operating Procedures.

As horses are gathered, they would be sorted and a 10-15 yearlings and foals would be transported to a separate location to be prepared for an adoption event. The event would be held on the first available Saturday after receiving the required health documents, and any other documentation for the adoption of the horses after the conclusion of the gather. The remaining horses would be transported to a BLM wild horse and burro facility in Ridgecrest, California.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Tonopah Resource Management Plan Date Approved: October 1997

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

- To create healthy, productive rangelands through implementation of ongoing rangeland monitoring and evaluation program.
- To improve the condition of public rangelands to enhance the productivity for all rangeland values.
- To manage wild horse and/or burro populations within HMAs at levels which will preserve and maintain a thriving natural ecological balance consistent with other multiple-use objectives.
- Manage Wild horses and/or burros at appropriate management level (AML).
- Assure sufficient water and forage exists for wild horses and/or burros in HMAs.
- When the AML is exceeded, remove excess wild horses and/or burros to a point which may allow up to three years of population increase before again reaching the appropriate management level.
- Manage the vegetation resource for the desired plant communities.
- Manage for proper functioning condition on all streamside riparian areas, and all springs, seeps, wet meadows and other riparian areas in the Tonopah Planning Area.
- Habitat for all federally listed threatened and endangered species or Nevada BLM Sensitive Species (plant and animal) will be managed to maintain or increase current populations of these species.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Reveille Herd Management Area Final Wild Horse Gather Plan and Environmental Assessment DOI-

BLM-NV-B020-2010-0089-EA, dated July, 2010.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

- Fallini v. Hodel, Case No. CV-R-85-535-BRT, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment, November 28, 1986.
- Fallini v. Hodel, Case No. CV-R-85-535-BRT, Second Order Amending Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment, November 13, 1987.
- October 1, 1987 Stipulated Settlement (CV-R-85-535-BRT)
- Reveille Allotment Final Multiple Use Decision (FMUD), 2001.
- 2001 IBLA Decision (IBLA 2001-327)
- 2002 IBLA Decision (IBLA 2002-60)

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Yes. The new proposed action is similar to the Proposed Action analyzed in the Reveille Herd Management Area Final Wild Horse Gather Plan and Environmental Assessment (DOI-BLM-NV-B020-2010-0089-EA) dated July, 2010 (2010 EA). The Proposed Action would occur within the same analysis area and involve the gathering and removal of excess wild horses in accordance with the Stipulated Settlement dated October 1, 1987 and 2001 and 2002 IBLA Orders.

- 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Yes, since the completion of the 2010 EA, there are no new environmental concerns, interests, resource values or circumstances that were not addressed in the 2010 EA or that would require additional alternatives to be developed. The Proposed Action described in the 2010 EA and the new Proposed Action are similar in terms of the gather and contraceptive methods and the geographic area affected, and are both consistent with the Stipulated Settlement dated October 1, 1987 and 2001 and 2002 IBLA Orders.

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action.**

Yes. There is no new information or circumstances that would change the validity of the existing analysis. The impacts of the new Proposed Action would be similar to those described under the Proposed Action in the 2010 EA.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Yes, the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects resulting from the implementation of the new Proposed Action would be similar to those disclosed under the Proposed Action in the 2010 EA because current range conditions and the number of horses remaining on the HMA are similar.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes. The public involvement and interagency review associated with the Reveille Herd Management Area Final Wild horse Gather Plan and Environmental Assessment is adequate for the Proposed Action. The 2010 EA was posted for a 30-day public comment period and comments received were considered in the development of that document.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name/Title	Resource Represented
Austin Brewer, Wild Horse and Burro Specialist	Wild Horse and Burros
Chris Herr, Rangeland Management Specialist	Range
Aaron Romesser, Rangeland Management Specialist	Vegetation, Soils
David Price, Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife, T&E Species
Mark Ennes, Planning and Environmental Coordinator	NEPA Compliance
Deej Brown, Assistant Field Manager	Renewable Resources
Alan Shepherd, BLM Nevada State Lead	Wild Horse and Burros

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

Conclusion *(If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.)*

☒ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

/s/ Austin Brewer

Signature of Project Lead

/s/ Mark Ennes

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ Timothy Coward

08/13/2014

Signature of Responsible Official:

Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.

Figure 1.

